

REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 2-4, 9-18, 21, 22, 24, 26-31, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over ELSEY et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0184593) in view of THORPE et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0093120) and CELIK (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0021111). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.¹

Independent claim 10 recites a method for obtaining contact information. The method includes receiving, by a service center, a request initiated by a user for contact information associated with a telephone number; querying, by the service center and in response to the request, a directory for the contact information; querying, by the service center and in response to the request, an Internet search engine for the contact information; receiving the contact information from at least one of the directory and the Internet search engine at the service center; and automatically storing, via the service center, the contact information in a contact list associated with the user in response to receiving the contact information at the service center. ELSEY et al., THORPE et al., and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, ELSEY et al., THORPE et al., and CELIK do not disclose or suggest querying, by a service center and in response to a request, an Internet search engine for the contact information. The Examiner relies on Fig. 5 and element 46 of

¹ As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicants' silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons for modifying a reference and/or combining references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or that such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

THORPE et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 10 (Office Action, pg. 4).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of THORPE et al.

Fig. 5 of THORPE et al. illustrates a directory assistance database including search engine 46, a master-listing repository 48, and a network interface 50 (paragraph 0035). Search engine 46 is not equivalent to an Internet search engine. Rather, as noted above, search engine 46 is part of a directory assistance database used to search the master-listing repository 48. Therefore, this section of THORPE et al. does not disclose or suggest querying, by a service center and in response to a request, an Internet search engine for the contact information, as recited in claim 10.

For at least the foregoing reason, Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable over ELSEY et al., THORPE et al., and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 11-14 depend from claim 10. Therefore, claims 11-14 are patentable over ELSEY et al. and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Independent claims 15 and 21 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, claims 15 and 21 are patentable over ELSEY et al., THORPE et al., and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Claims 2-4, 9, 16-18, and 34-37 depend from claim 15. Therefore, claims 2-4, 9, 16-18, and 34-37 are patentable over ELSEY et al., THORPE et al., and CELIK, whether

taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 15.

Claims 22, 24, and 26-31 depend from claim 21. Therefore, claims 22, 24, and 26-31 are patentable over ELSEY et al., THORPE et al., and CELIK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 21.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Meagan S. Walling, Reg. No. 60,112/
Meagan S. Walling
Reg. No. 60,112

Date: July 15, 2008
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer No. 25537